

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/552,398	Applicant(s) KOYAMA, KAZUHIRO
	Examiner Sherali Ishrat	Art Unit 2624

All Participants:(1) Sherali Ishrat.**Status of Application:** _____

(3) _____.

(2) Mr. LaCava, Richard.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 22 April 2011**Time:** _____**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Na

Claims discussed:

1 and 17-28

Prior art documents discussed:

1449/892

Part II.**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:***See Continuation Sheet***Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Sherali Ishrat/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2624

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner informed Applicant's Attorney that independent claim 1 and dependent claims are allowable over prior art of record. Applicant has argued that non-elected claims 17-28 should also be allowed because they are dependent claims on claim 1 therefore they should be also allowed. Argument with respect to claims 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28 is valid however claims 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27 and 32 should be canceled because claim 17 contradicts independent claim therefore in order to place the application in condition for allowance claim 17 and its dependent claim should be canceled. Applicant Attorney agreed to cancel claim 17 and its dependent claim by an examiner's amendment. Furthermore Examiner informed Applicant's that following is the reasons for allowance of independent claim 1: independent claim 1 identifies distinct and unique limitations "a coding control unit for setting a parameter for compression-coding based on received decoding information outputted from the receiver side moving image decoding device, a coding unit for compression-coding the moving image signal decoded by the decoding unit by using the parameter for compression-coding outputted from the coding control unit, the coding unit starts operation when control information outputted from the coding control unit is inputted, performs intra-frame coding to a first frame after starting the operation, and performs inter-frame prediction coding to a subsequent frame. The prior art of record disclose transcoding and coding/decoding for transmitter /receiver, however fail to anticipate or render the above limitations obvious singularly or in combination.